

REMARKS

1. Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1, 13 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatenable over claims 1-3 of Application No. 12/751,614. Applicants previously submitted a terminal disclaimer which was disapproved because of formalities. Applicant will submit a substitute terminal disclaimer upon receiving a notice that the claims are allowable but for the double patenting rejection.

2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 5, 8, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Sakata Hidefumi et al. in view of Ishihara et al. in view of Got et al. Applicant traverses these rejections in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendments can be found for example in Fig. 4 and the corresponding description.

With respect to Sakata Hidefumi et al., the structure disclosed therein corresponds to the structure of the example of prior art described in the Description of Related Art of the present application. In Sakata, a plurality of convex portions (projections) that is arranged in a matrix as is illustrated in Fig. 3. The array pitch of the convex portions in each direction is set smaller than the wavelength of visible light in order to prevent the reflection of light. Paragraphs [0042] and [0043] of this reference describe that it is preferable to set each of pitches P1, P2, and P3 shown in Fig. 3 be within a range from 10 nm to 200 nm (from 0.01 μm to 0.2 μm).

However, as described from line 19 on the page 2 to line 24 on the page 3 of the present application, a structure in which many convex portions are formed with such a very small pitch has the problem that the quality of the video output of a liquid crystal display device is poor due to glittering and defocusing, which is caused by the lens effects of the individual convex portions.

The structure of the present invention is different from that of Sakata Hidefumi et al. In the presently claimed structure, "a plurality of ridge portions are narrow in width, and are formed as projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction, and are formed with a predetermined pitch by continuously extending the ridge portion . . . the pitch of the top portions of the transparent resistance film formed over the ridge portions ranges from 100 μm to 500 μm and is constant".

In a coordinate input device with the above structure, it possible to prevent glittering of light outputted from a liquid crystal display device and defocusing thereof. In addition, compared with Sakata Hidefumi et al., in the claimed arrangement, it is easier to make an interference fringe that is generated at the time of coordinate input operation invisible to the eyes of a user operator. Convex portions that are formed with a very small pitch ranging from 10 nm to 200 nm (from 0.01 μm to 0.2 μm) as disclosed by Sakata Hidefumi et al. are too small to be molded with the use of a resin material. Thus, it is likely that the resin-molded dimension/pitch varies from one convex portion to another. In addition, since it is very difficult to form a transparent conductive film 16 along the very small convex portions as a continuous film, there is a problem in that discontinuity in the film is likely to occur.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's combination of Sakata Hidefumi et al. and Goto et al. is improper. As disclosed in Sakata Hidefumi et al. (Fig. 3 and the paragraphs [0016] and [0049])

When the plurality of projections are formed only in one direction in a substantially periodical manner, polarized light travelling orthogonal to the direction (having a periodic structure) is hardly affected by the periodic structure of the projections. That is, reflection and diffraction of the polarized light are not reduced at the boundary between the air space and the transparent electrode. This problem can be solved by arranging the projections in a substantially periodical manner in at least two directions.

The above description expresses a negative view of the regular (periodic) arrangement of convex portions only in one direction. That is, the above description suggests that it is indispensable that convex portions should be arranged regularly in at least two directions. Therefore, this reference teaches away from the combination of a light guiding plate for a liquid crystal display device illustrated in Figs. 1A, 1B, and 3 of

Goto et al., which includes a plurality of convex portions arranged in one direction, with Sakata Hidefumi et al.

The combination of Sakata Hidefumi et al. and Ishihara et al. (US20010019379) also teaches away from the structure of claim 1. Sakata Hidefumi et al (Fig. 3 and paragraph [0043]) discloses that “[t]he pitches P1, P2 and P3 of the projections 21 and 22 can be preferably equal to or shorter than approximately one fifth of the shortest wavelength of visible light, in other words, about 450 nm . . . the pitches are preferably arranged to range from 10 to 200 nm. In addition, Sakata Hidefumi et al. (paragraphs [0009] and [0010]) describe that a plurality of projections is formed with a pitch smaller than the wavelength of visible light in order to reduce the reflection of light at a boundary between air space and a transparent electrode.

Thus from above disclosure, Sakata Hidefumi et al. teaches away from setting the pitch of projections 21 and 22 within a range from 100 μ m to 500 μ m, which is relatively large.

Ishihara et al., on the other hand, discloses in Fig. 16 and the paragraph [0065] “[t]he distance (or pitch) between the most **retreated point 19** in the front surface of the light guide 2 is **constant** (about 300 μ m or less).” Therefore, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Sakata Hidefumi et al. with Ishihara et al.

The structure of the present invention is different from that of Ishihara et al. in that, as illustrated in the exemplary embodiments of Fig. 4 of the present application, “the pitch of the top portions of the transparent resistance film formed over the ridge projections ranges from 100 μ m to 500 μ m **and is constant**”. As described above, Fig. 16 and paragraph [0065], of Ishihara et al. “The distance (or pitch) between the most **retreated point 19** in the front surface of the light guide 2 is **constant** (about 300 μ m or less)”. However, as can be understood from the relation of $\theta_1 = \theta_2 < \theta_3 = \theta_4 \cdots < \theta_{n-1} = \theta_n$ in Fig. 16 and the paragraph [0067], the pitch of projections 25 **varies**. Thus, the presently claimed invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Moreover, as presently claimed and as illustrated in the exemplary embodiments of Fig. 4 of the present application “the height (H) between the top portion of the

transparent resistance film and the bottom portion thereof ranges from 0.1 μm to 10 μm ." This claimed structure is not disclosed by Sakata Hidefumi et al.

In summary, the structure of the present invention is different from the structure of any of the cited documents in that, as illustrated in Fig. 4 of the present application, "the pitch of the top portions of the transparent resistance film formed over the ridge portions ranges from 100 μm to 500 μm and is constant" and, in addition, the "the height (H) between the top portion of the transparent resistance film and the bottom portion thereof ranges from .01 μm to 10 μm ".

These claimed features of the present invention provide advantages not disclosed or suggested in the cited art in that it is possible to make interference fringe that is generated at the time of coordinate input operation invisible to the eyes of a user operator easily and reliably. Thus, the present invention is not obvious over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 25, 2011

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr., Reg. No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200